

Addendum: Symmetries of the energy-momentum tensor

M. Sharif *

Department of Mathematics, University of the Punjab,
Quaid-e-Azam Campus Lahore-54590, PAKISTAN.

Abstract

In recent papers [1-3], we have discussed matter symmetries of non-static spherically symmetric spacetimes, static plane symmetric spacetimes and cylindrically symmetric static spacetimes. These have been classified for both cases when the energy-momentum tensor is non-degenerate and also when it is degenerate. Here we add up some consequences and the missing references about the Ricci tensor.

Keyword: Matter symmetries

*e-mail: hasharif@yahoo.com

Recently, we have presented a detailed analysis of matter collineations (MCs) for non-static spherically symmetric spacetimes [1], static plane symmetric spacetimes [2] and cylindrically symmetric static spacetimes [3]. We have discussed in detail the matter symmetries for each of the metrics and have found the corresponding constraint equations. In general, it is not easy to solve these constraint equations even sometimes the solution of the constraint equations may not exist. We have constructed some examples which help us in exploring the difference between RCs and MCs.

It is usually believed that matter and Ricci symmetries are the similar symmetries and one can find MCs directly from the RCs. However, this is not true in general. This has been shown in many papers on this topic [1-9]. In this short communication, we express this difference with examples. Further, we add up some references missing in the papers [1-3] which should have been inserted there.

Let (M, g) be a spacetime manifold with signature $(+, -, -, -)$. It is assumed that the manifold M , and the metric g , are smooth. Einstein's field equations (EFEs), which relate the geometry and matter, are given by

$$R_{ab} - \frac{1}{2}Rg_{ab} \equiv G_{ab} = \kappa T_{ab}, \quad (a, b = 0, 1, 2, 3), \quad (1)$$

where κ is the gravitational constant, G_{ab} is the Einstein tensor, R_{ab} is the Ricci and T_{ab} is the matter (energy-momentum) tensor. Also, $R = g^{ab}R_{ab}$ is the Ricci scalar. It is obvious from EFEs that for vacuum spacetimes, $R_{ab} = T_{ab}$ and consequently, RCs and MCs are similar in this special case.

We define a differentiable vector field ξ on M to be a *matter collineation* if $\mathcal{L}_\xi T_{ab} = 0$ which can be written in component form as

$$T_{ab,c}\xi^c + T_{ac}\xi_{,b}^c + T_{cb}\xi_{,a}^c = 0, \quad (2)$$

where $\mathcal{L}$ is the Lie derivative operator, ξ^a is the symmetry or collineation vector. Since the Einstein tensor is related to the matter content of the spacetime by the EFEs, the investigation of MCs seems to be more relevant from the viewpoint of physics. Here we would not give details of the calculations as the procedure has been explicitly given in the papers [1-3]. Rather we would explore the difference of RCs and MCs for non-static spherically symmetric, static plane symmetric and cylindrically symmetric static spacetimes with the help of examples.

The most general form of the metric for a spherically symmetric spacetime is given by

$$ds^2 = e^{\nu(t,r)} dt^2 - e^{\mu(t,r)} dr^2 - e^{\lambda(t,r)} d\Omega^2, \quad (3)$$

where $d\Omega^2 = d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2$. The surviving components of the energy-momentum tensor are T_{00} , T_{01} , T_{11} , T_{22} , T_{33} , where $T_{33} = \sin^2\theta T_{22}$. We have found [1] that, for the non-degenerate case, there exist either four, six, seven or ten independent MCs in which four are isometries and the rest are the proper. For the degenerate case, most of the cases give the infinite dimensional MCs. The worth noting cases are those where the energy-momentum tensor is degenerate but the group of MCs is finite-dimensional, i.e., four or ten. Similar analysis has been given in the paper [10] for the

Ricci tensor. It can be seen from the comparison of the two papers [1,10] that MCs and RCs turn out to be the same but the constraint equations are entirely different. For example, in the Einstein/anti-Einstein metric, we obtain seven MCs [5] but RCs are infinite dimensional.

The metric for static plane symmetric spacetimes is given in the form [11]

$$ds^2 = e^{\nu(x)} dt^2 - dx^2 - e^{\mu(x)} (dy^2 + dz^2). \quad (4)$$

The surviving components of the energy-momentum tensor are T_0 , T_1 , T_2 , T_3 , where $T_3 = T_2$. When we solve MC equations for the static plane symmetric spacetimes it turns out [2] that the non-degenerate case yields either four, five, six, seven or ten independent MCs in which four are isometries and the rest are proper. We have also obtained three interesting cases where the energy-momentum tensor is degenerate but the group of MCs is finite-dimensional which are either four, six or ten.

Again when we compare the analysis given in the two papers [2,12], it is concluded that RCs and MCs are similar but with different constraint equations. We can construct some examples by solving these constraint equations which exhibit the difference between RCs and MCs admitted by the spacetime. Consider the following plane symmetric static spacetime

$$ds^2 = (ax + b)^2 dt^2 - dx^2 - (cx + d)^2 (dy^2 + dz^2), \quad (5)$$

where $a, b, c, d \in \mathfrak{R}$, $ac \neq 0 \neq ad - bc$. In this example, we obtain five MCs in which three are the usual isometries and the remaining two are proper MCs

but the RCs are infinite dimensional.

The most general form of cylindrically symmetric static spacetime is given by

$$ds^2 = e^{\nu(r)} dt^2 - dr^2 - e^{\lambda(r)} d\theta^2 - e^{\mu(r)} dz^2. \quad (6)$$

The only non-zero components of the energy-momentum tensor turn out to be T_{00} , T_{11} , T_{22} , T_{33} . We have found [3] that the non-degenerate energy-momentum tensor gives either three, four, five, six, seven or ten independent MCs in which three are isometries and the rest are proper. There are four worth mentioning cases where we have obtained the group of MCs finite-dimensional even the energy-momentum tensor is degenerate, i.e., either three, four, five or ten. It can be seen from the two papers [3,13] that RCs and MCs become similar but the constraints are different. Here we present examples by solving these constraints which give different spacetimes for the two collineations.

The following cylindrically symmetric metric

$$ds^2 = \cosh^2 cr dt^2 - dr^2 - (\cosh cr)^{-1} d\theta^2 - (\cosh cr)^{-1} dz^2, \quad (7)$$

where c is an arbitrary constant, admits 4 MCs and also 4 isometries but it has 7 RCs. The spacetime

$$ds^2 = (r/r_0)^{2a} dt^2 - dr^2 - (r/r_0)^{2a} d\theta^2 - (r/r_0)^{2a} dz^2, \quad (8)$$

where a and r_0 are arbitrary constants such that $a \neq 0, 1$, admits 10 MCs with 6 KVs but 7 RCs. Taking $\nu = \lambda = \mu$ in Eq.(6), this metric admits 6

MCs and also 6 KVs but 7 RCs. The following spacetime

$$ds^2 = (\cosh cr)^{-1} dt^2 - dr^2 - \cosh^2 cr d\theta^2 - (\cosh cr)^{-1} dz^2. \quad (9)$$

has 4 MCs and also 4 KVs but 7 RCs.

In this addendum, we have provided examples which clearly indicate the difference of the symmetries for the Ricci and matter tensors. Also, we have incorporated the missing references in the previous papers [1-3]. It is mentioned here that RCs and MCs will exactly be similar for those spacetimes where $R_{ab} = T_{ab}$ or equivalently for vacuum spacetimes. For example, in the case of Schwarzschild metric, every direction is RC/MC.

References

- [1] Sharif, M.: J. Math. Phys. **44**(2003)5142.
- [2] Sharif, M.: J. Math. Phys. **45**(2004)1518.
- [3] Sharif, M.: J. Math. Phys. **45**(2004)1532.
- [4] Sharif, M.: Nuovo Cimento **B116**(2001)673.
- [5] Sharif, M.: Astrophys. Space Sci. **278**(2001)447.
- [6] Camcı, U. and Sharif, M.: Gen Rel. and Grav. **35**(2003)97.
- [7] Camcı, U. and Sharif, M.: Class. Quant. Grav. **20**(2003)2169-2179.

- [8] Sharif, M. and Sehar Aziz: Gen Rel. and Grav. **35**(2003)1091.
- [9] Tsamparlis, M. and Apostolopoulos, P.S.: Gen. Rel. and Grav. **36**(2004)47.
- [10] Ziad, M.: Gen. Relativ. Gravit. **35**(2003)915.
- [11] Stephani, H., Kramer, D., MacCallum, M.A.H., Hoenselaers, C. and
Hearlt, E.: *Exact Solutions of Einstein's Field Equations* (Cambridge
University Press, 2003).
- [12] Farid, Taha Bin, Qadir Asghar and Ziad, M.: J. Math. Phys. **36**(191995)5812.
- [13] Qadir, Asghar, Saifullah, K. and Ziad, M.: Gen. Relativ. Gravit.
35(2003)1927.